DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 219 846 EA 014 750

AUTHOR Hamlyn, Geoffrey
TITLE Educational Facilities Policies in the 80s. Report on the Symposium held in Lochem, The Netherlands, October 1980. Programme on Educational Building.
INSTITUTION Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris (France).
REPORT NO PEB-11
PUB DATE 82
NOTE 22p.
AVAILABLE FROM Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development Publications and Information Center, Suite 1207, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20006-4582 (free).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Involvement; *Educational Facilities; *Educational Policy; *Educational Trends; Facility Requirements; Facility Utilization Research; Foreign Countries; *Futures (of Society); Resource Allocation; School Community Relationship; Shared Facilities; Social Change

ABSTRACT

Educational facilities experts from a score of countries considered how changing economic and social conditions, as well as technological developments, will require redefinition both of existing educational facilities and of their use. Participants agreed that new needs are arising from demographic change, world recession, and unemployment. The requirements of youth, the elderly, and the very young, as well as those of migrant populations and handicapped people, are emerging as major preoccupations. Policy recommendations for the solution of the conflict between increasing needs and diminishing resources were to (1) coordinate school and community facilities; (2) use existing educational and other buildings effectively; (3) involve community members in decisions that affect their community; and (4) suit the quality of the educational environment to the needs of the users. To implement these policies, the experts recommended the removal of institutional, legislative, and financial barriers; the continual tracking of changing local needs; the evaluation of opportunities provided by existing facilities for meeting such needs; and the evaluation of new capital projects. (MLF)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Paris (France).
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 014 750

peb II

PROGRAMME ON EDUCATIONAL BUILDING

# EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES POLICIES IN THE 80s

Report on the Symposium held in Lochem, The Netherlands, October 1980

by
Geoffrey Hamlyn,
County Architect, Cheshire

ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) was set up under a Convention signed in Paris on 14th December 1960, which provides that the OECD shall promote policies designed:

- to achieve the highest sustainable economic growth and employment and a rising standard of living in Member countries, while maintaining financial stability, and thus to contribute to the development of the world economy;
- to contribute to sound economic expansion in Member as well as non-member countries in the process of economic development;
- to contribute to the expansion of world trade on a multilateral non-discriminatory basis in accordance with international obligations.

The Members of OECD are Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States. The Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia is associated in certain work of the OECD, particularly that of the Programme on Educational Building.

The Programme on Educational Building (PEB) was established by the Council of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development as from January 1972. Its present mandate expires at the end of 1984.

The main objectives of the Programme are:

- to facilitate the exchange of information and experience on aspects of educational building judged to be important by participating Member countries;
- to promote co-operation between such Member countries regarding the technical bases for improving the quality, speed and cost effectiveness of school construction.

The Programme functions within the Directorate for Social Affairs, Manpower and Education of the Organisation in accordance with the decisions of the Council of the Organisation, under the authority of the Secretary-General. It is directed by a Steering Committee of senior government officials, and financed by participating governments.

THE OPINION EXPRESSED AND ARGUMENTS EMPLOYED IN THIS LEAFLET ARE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE AUTHOR AND DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT THOSE OF THE OECD

French title:

LES POLITIQUES D'ÉQUIPEMENTS ÉDUCATIFS
DANS LES ANNÉES 80

© OECD, 1982
Queries concerning permissions or translation rights should be addressed to:
Director of Information, OECD
2, rue André-Pascal, 75775 PARIS CEDEX 16, France.

Educational building policies have for a long time been determined by the need to provide new buildings for increasing school populations. In most countries, this is no longer the essential need and the main preoccupation now concerns the use of the existing infrastructure of facilities and its adaptation to qualitative change. This change of emphasis raised questions regarding the nature of the problems ahead, the kind of policies required to overcome them and the change in attitudes needed to enable these policies to be implemented. It was to seek answers to these questions that the Programme on Educational Building (PEB) organised a Symposium on "Educational Facilities Policies in the 80s" in Lochem, the Netherlands, in the autumn of 1980.

The present leaflet reflects the spirit and main results of the Lochem Symposium. It is a personal resumé by the Rapporteur General, Mr. Geoffrey Hamlyn, of the discussions which took place at the Symposium between experts, practitioners and those responsible for facilities policies from a score of countries. It examines future issues by considering how today's problems are likely to evolve in the next few years and also identifies a number of questions requiring further study as a basis for longer-term policies.

For a full understanding of this paper, some reference needs to be made to the kind of changes which will affect the overall context of facilities policies and which formed the subject of several of the papers presented at the Symposium. There is no doubt that these changes will in future have a far greater impact on facilities than in the past. Responding to the changing economic and social context, as well as to technological developments, will demand changes in the objectives, structures and methods of education systems which will also have to cater for a more varied public. The nature of facilities and the way they are used will need to be modified accordingly. Besides such indirect influences, changes in the context will also have direct effects on facilities. Access and location will, for example, be affected by changes in ways of life, work and habitat; economic constraints will influence design and construction, as shown by the particular case of energy conservation measures; technological development itself, for instance by modifying information and communication systems,will lead to new types of facilities.

The Lochem Symposium clearly showed that the effectiveness of future facilities policies will depend on the extent to which solutions can be developed which integrate both types of influences in response not only to educational requirements but also to the direct effects of changes in social, economic and technological conditions. However, policies will not be determined by these influences alone. As stated in one of the Symposium papers in relation to the "micro-processor revolution", what is technically possible is not necessarily probable. Therefore, the solutions that will be adopted will also depend on political motivations and choices which are difficult to foresee.

## PEB INFORMATION LEAFLETS

Available in limited numbers from the PEB Secretariat or from national correspondents to PEB (see address list at the back of this leaflet).

1. School Building Today and Tomorrow, 1973. Out of print.
2. Maiden Erlegh: An English Secondary School Development Project (Booth, C.), 1973
3. C.R.O.C.S.: A Swiss Industrialised School Building System (Lenssen, P.), 1973
4. ff5: A Canadian "Casework" or Furniture and Equipment System for Schools (Lenssen, P.), 1974
5. Industrialised Building Systems, Educational Objectives and the Problem of Change (Phillips, C.W.), 1974
6. Institutional Arrangements for School Building (Lindsay, N.), 1975
7. Teachers and School Building (Rodhe, B.), 1976
8. Deleted
9. Educational Building: Policies and Co-operation, 1977
10. Co-ordination of School and Community Facilities: Implications for Policies, 1978
11. Educational Facilities Policies in the 80s (Hamlyn, G.), 1982
12. Relocatable Schools in New Zealand (Ayliffe, J. and Jeffares, M.), 1982
13. Physically Handicapped Children. A Design Project for the Under-Fives (Manson, J. and Oddie, G.B.), 1982
14. Remodelling of a Lycée in Grenoble (Roche, G.) to be issued
15. Bridgwater Tertiary College (Miles, J.C., Sharp, R.M. and Swindale, G.B.) to be issued

For PEB publications, see list at the back of this leaflet

CONTENTS


| | |
|---|---|
| INTRODUCTION | 6 |
| SOCIAL PROVISION AND LOCAL DEVELOPMENT | 7 |
| COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT | 9 |
| TRANSFORMING THE STOCK | 10 |
| STANDARDS OF PROVISION | 12 |
| IMPEDIMENTS TO CHANGE | 13 |
| CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 14 |


A number of background papers dealing with various aspects of the above themes were prepared for the Symposium by specialists drawn from several countries. For further information, please contact the PEB Secretariat (address at the end of the Leaflet).

## INTRODUCTION

Until the early 1970s most OECD countries were engaged in major programmes of expanding educational facilities. These concentrated on new construction to meet increasing school populations. It was a period of confidence in education, and of innovation and change in educational structure. Considerable advances were made in developing improved techniques for briefing and design, cost planning and construction as well as in the emerging trend to associate educational and other social facilities. Policies in this period were conducted against two general expectations; firstly, that full-time education would normally lead to employment; secondly, that expenditure on education, including capital investments, would not slacken.

Despite this intense activity, covering more than two decades, the overall demand for compulsory education is still unsatisfied in many countries and in all of them buildings are to be found which present deficiencies in several respects. Even in those countries where pupil numbers are declining (dramatically in some cases), new needs are arising. These are not difficult to discern. They arise from demographic change and a world recession, one of the symptoms of which is unemployment. The effect of the latter is compounded by job displacement arising from the development of microprocessor techniques, and both will demand a new approach to continuous education and training. These factors, together with the prospect of a reduced working life and a shorter working week, implying increased leisure, will alter the conventional view of the form and character educational facilities should take. In this context, the requirements of youth, the elderly, and the very young, as well as those of migrant populations and handicapped people, requirements which have often been neglected in the past, are emerging as major preoccupations.

Basically, the most important characteristic of these new needs is that they arise outside the compulsory age range; this means that educational systems formerly directed towards a captive and largely uncritical audience, will need to consider new forms of institutional and management structures. This does not imply, however, that less attention

should be paid to issues relating to provision for the compulsory age range; these must also develop to meet new challenges. It simply means that it will be necessary for enabling agencies to base planning on wider criteria than in the past; there will be greater emphasis on public participation in decision-making and on the relationships with other aspects of social and economic life.

It was against this background that the Symposium considered the way in which existing policies require re-definition and further development if they are to respond most effectively to meet changing needs. Discussion took place in groups under three general headings:

i) Transforming the Stock of Facilities
ii) Educational Facilities and Local Development
iii) Economic Aspects of Facilities Policies

It was recognised that the three topics were inter-related and could not be discussed in isolation. This report summarises the main points which emerged from the discussions and which have major implications for educational facilities policies in the 1980s. It discusses some of the implications for education arising from present socio-economic change; puts forward certain solutions and identifies difficulties of implementation within existing management and policy structures. The report identifies areas for further investigation and draws final conclusions.

## SOCIAL PROVISION AND LOCAL DEVELOPMENT

The co-ordination of school and community facilities is a concept which formed the subject of the previous OECD/PEB symposium in Sweden in 1976. Although many experiments in this direction have been undertaken (from the late 50s onwards) no country has so far adopted co-ordination as a general policy. Yet the present Symposium expressed no doubt at all that such a policy was needed; indeed the need was taken for granted. Access to a wider range of facilities was seen to be necessary to create better opportunities for all, both in career development, human relationships and lifelong education. Integration was seen as a means of providing such facilities at lower cost by avoiding duplication and reducing the risk of under-utilisation. However, the greatest emphasis was placed on functional aspects and on the way in which integration can help to meet the new needs. This is because the particular educational needs of

different groups of people - the unemployed, very young children, youth, old people, migrants, handicapped, and so on - are only part of the full range of social needs relating to these groups. Furthermore, the distinction between what is an educational need and what is a social need is extremely blurred; education, welfare, health, housing and so on all inter-act with each other.

Earlier developments towards integration were, however, conducted in the expansionary era of new construction. For the majority of countries, large scale new building is no longer either possible or desirable. The advantages of co-ordination must therefore be secured by other means; hence the importance of regarding educational buildings not as isolated and inviolable, but as part and parcel of the total stock of publicly owned building accommodating other social services as well. Thus an effective policy for co-ordinating facilities is dependent on a complementary policy for a unified approach to the use and development of the stock of social building as a whole.

Existing social facilities are normally dispersed, often widely, across the locality they serve. Thus there is a need to meet local needs more effectively by greater co-ordination of dispersed networks of facilities. While it is possible to draw a distinction between urban and rural areas, when considering how such redeployment can be most effective certain advantages of co-ordination are applicable to both and can:

i) improve services provision by a selective use of facilities according to their location;

ii) inter-relate school and other facilities for complementary activities (continuing education, training of the unemployed);

iii) retain and improve the quality of existing buildings and environments;

iv) offer greater opportunities for community use of school facilities;

v) allow the possibility of using a partly occupied school for additional services rather than closing it. Such spare capacity in schools should be seen as an opportunity to make provision for other needs in the wider aspect of education and/or other social services.

But co-ordination has a special significance in rural areas because it can be argued that the economic and social role of the school is more important in the country than in towns. Because of this, the maintenance of rural networks must be measured in terms of the quality of life which should be available to the rural community. Where it is unavoidable that unit costs should rise, this should be accepted in order to counter-balance disadvantage and thus help to reinforce the essential qualities of rural life; essential that is to the nation as a whole.

It is thus clear that education, whether in urban or rural areas, will increasingly need to take local circumstances into account, whatever its organisational form or curriculum and whatever form of integration might emerge. Broad concepts on habits of thought and behaviour are more effectively learned if they can readily be related to the familiar realities of everyday life in its local context. But the new needs and the best ways of meeting them are even more subject to local circumstances. Thus urban and rural facilities networks must be both locally accessible and responsive. Therefore local decision-making is of fundamental importance for all aspects of facility policies for the future.

## COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

The pressures for greater public involvement in decisions which affect their environment, both social and physical, come from a wide variety of sources. Many have noticed the frustrations which characterise modern societies and which arise from the remoteness of the individual from mary of the major decisions taken by - or on behalf of - the society in which he lives. There are a number of important steps which need to be taken if these frustrations are to be overcome and the local population is to be given a greater opportunity to participate in decision making. The first step must be a major change in the traditional relationships between enabling agencies and the local community. These changes should aim to achieve the following results:

i) Processes should be developed to ensure that the local community is in a position to take informed decisions. This implies a participatory process which fully involves the users in planning and design and in the evaluation systems which decide what forms facilities should take.

ii) To this end detailed information of development proposals should be provided well in advance of implementation, especially if the proposals relate to school re-organisation or closure.

iii) The use of existing and new communication techniques should be maximised where necessary to ensure that data is available on all aspects of community development.

iv) The community should be involved in the co-operative management of facilities which will require devolution of responsibility from central to local level, as well as to the individual institution. Certain decisions still have to be made centrally or regionally, but local attitudes should have greater influence than in the past.

Basically, the essential change of attitude may be best expressed by a quotation from one discussion group: "the direction of change should be away from 'this is what you will have' towards 'this is how you decide what you will have'". But there is no universally applicable method for public participation and methods will vary according to the local context. If it is to be successful, such participation will require both technical help and political support.

If such assistance is forthcoming it will help to diminish those conflicts which generally arise between traditional modes of policy determination and emerging community needs which seek to modify them. Failure to respond may well engender far more violent conflict. It must be concluded that genuine community involvement will call for adaptations and sometimes major changes in accepted procedure and that this is an aspect which would warrant further study.

## TRANSFORMING THE STOCK

Any consideration of facilities policies for the 1980s must be made under the shadow of financial constraints and the knowledge that new investment will be severely limited. In such circumstances, it is necessary to ensure that the best possible use is made of existing resources. In the case of a school facilities agency the major resource

now is the stock of buildings and land which it usually owns and directly controls. In present circumstances of demographic change there are wide fluctuations in the pattern of use of this stock. Some schools are only partly full; some are even empty. Yet other social needs which require buildings remain unfulfilled. Rationalisation of the building stock thus presents opportunities for reconciling needs and resources and should be recognised as a vehicle for achieving social and educational objectives economically. As already indicated, considerable advantages would accrue to the education service if educational facilities were considered as part of social facilities as a whole. A corporate approach to a policy of building transformation could therefore facilitate:

i) sharing buildings by education and other social services;

ii) exchange and transfer of buildings between educational institutions and between the education sector and other bodies;

iii) leasing arrangements (short or long) in order to ensure that surplus accommodation is:

   a) kept in public ownership as a reserve for future needs
   b) available to promote socially effective interests which could not otherwise be viable
   c) used to produce an income from other lessees; (or exchanged with private sector facilities);

iv) outright disposal to provide capital for upgrading of retained facilities to meet the need for better functional and environmental quality.

However, as recurrent budgets must meet more than maintenance and operating costs, capital investment is essential to the effective exploitation of the resources represented by existing budgets. There must be an element for transformation of facilities, or addition to them, so that they can keep pace with continually changing needs. But such investment should be governed by the objective of spending now to save in the future.

## STANDARDS OF PROVISION

The topic of design quality and standards of provision arose in many discussion groups, often in differing contexts. There was a consensus of opinion regarding the effect of environment on human personality, especially concerning the internal and external characteristics of buildings themselves. It was accepted that buildings can have a profound effect for good or ill on those who use them.

It is now generally recognised that much post-war building does not meet present standards. There are many reasons for this, not least the too severe limitation of cost and time. Many economies of the past are now proving to have been very dearly bought.

While accepting that economic circumstances and standards will vary from one country to another, there is an urgent need for past criteria to be re-evaluated. Particular emphasis should be placed on the need to

i) take account of the kind of architectural character which supports and stimulates the user and which avoids an institutional image;

ii) retain familiar environments if possible, especially in the local context;

iii) create diversity by reflecting differing user requirements in combined facilities;

iv) accept that, in certain cases at least, a premium must be paid to support the quality of new or existing environments.

Super-imposed upon all these requirements is the need to design for flexibility and future change in the sure knowledge that the future is uncertain. Although this was recognised in the past it was never adequately implemented. It is now crucial. For example, although the impact of the micro-processor on educational techniques is still very much in the realm of speculation, it is certain to affect the way people live and thus how buildings are used. For this and similar reasons, design should aim at solutions which favour future change of use without

sacrificing present needs. This is a topic requiring further study and which might well be suited to co-operative research between countries.

## IMPEDIMENTS TO CHANGE

The many suggestions put forward and summarised above, regarding the new approaches needed to make educational facilities policies more effective, were seen to be impeded by a number of factors. Generally, but not exclusively, these stem from the continuation of out-dated institutional arrangements which no longer reflect changing needs. It is therefore extremely urgent that action should be taken to remove such barriers to progress. This should focus on reviewing current institutional arrangements and proposing such changes in procedures and legislation as the new circumstances demand. None of the issues raised below are in any way new, but the changing context means that their effects are compounded and that new and constructive solutions are inhibited. The problems concern:

i) Departmentalism and intersectoral barriers both at central and local level, which, even in more prosperous times, caused major delays in co-ordinating resources between agencies. Present economic circumstances now tend to reinforce such isolation. This lends even greater importance to breaking down such barriers and developing a corporate approach.

ii) Difficulties of co-ordinating finance, including

   a) financial procedures which include non-transferable resources, and thus inhibit choice between new building and re-modelling

   b) separate and normally exclusive budgets for building maintenance, minor works, operating costs and energy conservation measures

   c) restrictive cost limits which are still in many cases fixed relative to new construction and do not reflect emerging and differing applications

   d) policies of concentrating on the first capital costs as a yardstick rather than life cycle costs.

iii) Legislative restraints relating to planning, land use, building, health and safety all of which can create formidable impediments to rationalisation. Broadly they fall into two groups:

a) central legislation; that which restricts inter-institutional exchange and transfer by the agency itself

b) local legislation which limits the initiative of the community or school, especially in the context of 'self-help' activity, and reduces their participation in the processes of decision-making.

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Educational facilities policies in the 1980s will vary between countries according to the different situations facing them. These are essentially of two kinds: while the minority of countries still has the problem of developing their facilities to meet the demands of a school population which continues to increase, the majority, with a declining school-age population, is facing the new problem of redeploying the resources represented by the existing stock of facilities. However, whatever their situation, all countries will need to meet new demands resulting from changes in the socio-economic fabric. Thus, a great number of the Symposium recommendations are applicable to both groups of countries. It is likely, though, that for the minority countries, where the order of priorities is different, the implementation of these recommendations will raise specific problems which need to be given particular consideration.

The new demands engendered by social and economic changes include

i) a need for job-orientated training to meet the new technological situation;

ii) a requirement for educational activities which will meet the need of a society in which the individuals will have increased leisure time;

iii) demands arising from the widely differing needs of youth, the elderly, migrant populations and the handicapped;

iv) the diverse needs of immigrants or other cultural, ethnic and linguistic minorities;

v) an increasing demand for public participation in the development of educational and related facilities.

These needs are not only widely diversified, they are likely to be subject to more rapid change than has been the case in the past. They reflect the efforts societies will need to make to adapt to the rapid structural and technological changes which are already affecting our daily lives. It must be borne in mind that the so-called traditional education of those in the compulsory school age group must also change to meet the new situation; this has not happened rapidly enough in the past.

The overriding problems for educational facilities in the 1980s is how to meet the various demands in the face of severe restraint on public spending with limited prospects of economic growth.

The Symposium was principally concerned with the resolution of this conflict between increasing needs and diminishing resources. Four major policies were considered necessary for the solution of this problem.

i) Facilities integration. Education and other services should be treated as an integrated whole. School and community facilities should be co-ordinated and they should be related to the total situation. In particular, there should be a recognition of the different needs of rural and urban communities.

ii) The building stock. The existing stock of educational and other buildings serving the communities forms a major resource which must be used effectively. To achieve this:

a) the stock must be evaluated against defined needs by appropriate methodologies,

b) redistribution and recycling of the stock must be encouraged,

c) capital must be made available to upgrade or remodel buildings and to make necessary additions to the stock in order to increase its potential to meet changing needs. Such capital should be injected in accordance with a policy of "spending to save", concentrated on

projects which increase the return obtained from the existing stock or which reduce recurrent costs.

iii) Increasing pressures for community involvement in decisions which affect that particular community must be recognised. The people concerned should receive every encouragement to take part in the process of determining the nature and form of facilities intended to serve their community. They should have the opportunity to understand the processes of decision-making and to take a full part in making the decisions. This involvement should apply whether the decisions concern networks, adaptations or new provision and the people should also be concerned with the continuing management of the facilities. This implies a greater delegation from the centre than has hitherto been the case in most countries. In addition, means must be available for resolving conflict between neighbouring communities and ensuring that supra-local and national interests are satisfied as well.

iv) While promoting community participation and accepting the necessity for financial restraint, no-one should lose sight of the fact that educational accommodation, whatever its specific purpose, should provide a quality of environment suited to its educational purpose and to the aesthetic and other needs of the users. At the same time, the design should take into account the possibility of further change. Policies will emphasise the importance of these two factors.

The Symposium drew particular attention to barriers which must be removed if the above broad policies are to be implemented. These barriers are of three main kinds:

i) institutional: barriers which isolate one sector of education from another and all educational sectors from the other social sectors and prevent them from acting in partnership;

ii) legislative: barriers which reinforce institutional isolation and inhibit the sharing or exchange of facilities between sectors, or prevent their disposal to raise money for the necessary injection of new capital;

iii) financial: barriers such as those which separate capital from recurrent funding and inhibit the rational balance between the two which is implied for example by life-cycle costing.

Support of the policies recommended demands the rapid development of a number of techniques. These can be grouped under three heads concerning

i) continual tracking of changing local needs;

ii) evaluation of opportunities provided by the existing stock for meeting such needs;

iii) evaluation of new capital projects against their expected return in pursuit of the policy of spending to save.

The Symposium saw a clear need for continued international co-operation to facilitate exchange of information and experience relevant both to the development of such techniques and to the formulation and carrying out of specific policies appropriate to different national, regional and local policies. It called in particular for an intensive effort to promote person-to-person contacts between people facing the day-to-day problems of developing techniques and policies to ensure that new and recycled resources produce together the maximum benefit for educational and allied purposes.

## PEB INFORMATION LEAFLETS

Issued by the OECD Programme on Educational Building (PEB), the leaflets aim at disseminating information on themes related to the activities of the Programme and on interesting examples of innovatory school building. They are particularly directed at administrators, local politicians, architects and educationists working in this field and it is hoped they will stimulate them in their search for new solutions to new problems. Leaflets are available in English and French. Requests for additional copies of available leaflets should be addressed directly to the PEB Secretariat, or alternatively, if from a participating country, to the national representative or correspondent to the Programme.

## NATIONAL REPRESENTATIVES AND/OR CORRESPONDENTS TO PEB

**AUSTRALIA**
Mr. J. MAYFIELD
Education Dept. of South Australia
Box 1152, GPO
ADELAIDE 5001

**AUSTRIA**
Mr. M. HINUM
Bundesministerium für Unterricht and Kunst
Bankgasse 9
1040 VIENNA

**BELGIUM**
Mr. R. CANTRAINE
Fonds des Bâtiments scolaires
Ministère de l'Education nationale et de la Culture Française
Rue Montoyer 57-59
BRUSSELS 1040

Mr. CLAEYS
Gebouwenfond Rijksscholen
Ministerie Nationale Opvoeding
J. de Lalainstract 28
BRUSSELS 1040

**DENMARK**
Mr. P. LARSEN
Byggedirektoratet
Ministry of Education
28 Nyropsgade
1602 COPENHAGEN K

Mr. H. HENNING HANSEN
Gammel Strand 50
1202 COPENHAGEN K

**FRANCE**
Mr. J. SIMON
Direction des Equipements et de la Construction
Ministère de l'Education nationale
142 rue du Bac
75357 PARIS

**IRELAND**
Mr. N. LINDSAY
Building Unit
Department of Education
Marlborough Street
DUBLIN 1

**NEW ZEALAND**
Mr. K.M. BURNS
Department of Education
WELLINGTON

**NETHERLANDS**
Mr. M.H.C. FAKKERT
School Building Department
Ministry of Education and Sciences
Rioumstraat 178
THE HAGUE

Mr. T.J. GEURSEN
I.C.S.
P.O. Box 20720
3001 JA ROTTERDAM

**NORWAY**
Mr. S. WIGTIL
Radet For Videregaende Opplaering
Postboks 8170
OSLO Dep

**PORTUGAL**
Mr. A.M. GONÇALVES
Direcção-Geral das Construçoes Escolares
Praça da Alvalade N°11 - 2°
LISBON 5

**SPAIN**
Mr. F. GARCIA DE PAREDES
Junta de Construcciones
Ministério de Educación y Ciencia
Alfonso XII, 18 - 5°
MADRID 14

**SWEDEN**
Mr. T. LANDHERR
Skolöverstyrelsen
Fack
106 42 STOCKHOLM

**SWITZERLAND**
Mr. E. BIELER
Service technique
Bâtiments et Locaux scolaires
D.I.P. 7 rue des Granges
1204 GENEVA

**TURKEY**
Mrs. G. ANDAC
Y. Mimar
Bayindirlik Bakanligi
Yapi Isleri Genel Müdürlüğü
ANKARA

**UNITED KINGDOM**
Mr. M. HACKER
Architects & Building Branch
Department of Education and Science
Elizabeth House,
39 York Road
LONDON SE1 7PH

## PEB SECRETARIAT

| | |
|---|---|
| Ms. L. GIBSON | Principal Administrator |
| Mr. J. ADER | Professional Staff Member |
| Ms. F. FRANCESCHI | Assistant |
| Ms. P. FOX | Secretary |
| Mr. G. ODDIE | Senior Adviser |

2, rue André Pascal
75775 PARIS CEDEX 16
Tel : 524 9260

SOME PEB PUBLICATIONS

BUILDING IMPLICATIONS OF THE MULTI-OPTION SCHOOL, by J. Ader (May 1975)
(95 75 02 1) ISBN 92-64-12340-1
112 pages ..... F36,00 £3.60 US$9.00

PROVIDING FOR FUTURE CHANGE, ADAPTABILITY AND FLEXIBILITY IN SCHOOL BUILDING (May 1976)
(95 76 01 1) ISBN 92-64-11847-4
112 pages ..... F28,00 £3.00 US$7.00

BUILDING FOR SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY
Vol I - POLICIES AND STRATEGIES, by T. Malan, G.B. Cddie (August 1978)
(95 78 01 1) ISBN 92-64-11784-9
212 pages ..... F40,00 £4.90 US$10.00

Vol.II - FRANCE, by R. Bergouignan, G. Le Boterf (June 1978)
(95 77 01 1) ISBN 92-64-11725-3
202 pages ..... F40,00 £4.90 US$10.00

Vol. III - UNITED STATES, by M. Kennedy, D. Lewis (January 1979)
(95 78 02 1) ISBN 92-64-11859-4
208 pages ..... F46,00 £5.60 US$11.50

Vol. IV - ENGLAND - AUSTRALIA, by G. Hawkins, B. Willcock (February 1980)
(95 80 01 1) ISBN 92-64-12024-6
190 pages ..... F46,00 £5.00 US$11.50

Vol. V - SWEDEN, by Å. Fältheim, S. Hansson, G. Trenning (March 1980)
(95 80 02 1) ISBN 92-64-12025-4
172 pages ..... F42,00 £4.70 US$10.50

SCHOOL FURNITURE, by D. Medd (October 1981)
(95 81 01 1) ISBN 92-64-12222-2
173 pages ..... F56,00 £5.60 US$12.50

To be published

SURPLUS SPACE IN SCHOOLS. AN OPPORTUNITY

Available from OECD Sales Agents (see list on the last page)

Prices charged at the OECD Publications Office

THE OECD CATALOGUE OF PUBLICATIONS and supplements will be sent free of charge on request addressed either to OECD Publications Office, 2, rue André Pascal, 75775 PARIS CEDEX 16, or to the OECD Sales Agent in your country

# OECD SALES AGENTS
# DÉPOSITAIRES DES PUBLICATIONS DE L'OCDE

**ARGENTINA – ARGENTINE**
Carlos Hirsch S.R.L., Florida 165, 4° Piso (Galería Guemes)
1333 BUENOS AIRES, Tel. 33.1787.2391 y 30.7122

**AUSTRALIA – AUSTRALIE**
Australia and New Zealand Book Company Pty. Ltd.,
10 Aquatic Drive, Frenchs Forest, N.S.W. 2086
P.O. Box 459, BROOKVALE, N.S.W. 2100

**AUSTRIA – AUTRICHE**
OECD Publications and Information Center
4 Simrockstrasse 5300 BONN. Tel. (0228) 21.60.45
Local Agent/Agent local :
Gerold and Co., Graben 31, WIEN 1. Tel. 52.22.35

**BELGIUM – BELGIQUE**
LCLS
35, avenue de Stalingrad, 1000 BRUXELLES. Tel. 02.512.89.74

**BRAZIL – BRÉSIL**
Mestre Jou S.A., Rua Guaipa 518,
Caixa Postal 24090, 05089 SAO PAULO 10. Tel 261.1920
Rua Senador Dantas 19 s/205-6, RIO DE JANEIRO GB.
Tel. 232.07.32

**CANADA**
Renouf Publishing Company Limited,
2182 St. Catherine Street West,
MONTRÉAL, Que. H3H 1M7. Tel. (514)937.3519
OTTAWA, Ont. K1P 5A6, 61 Sparks Street

**DENMARK – DANEMARK**
Munksgaard Export and Subscription Service
35, Nørre Søgade
DK 1370 KØBENHAVN K. Tel. +45.1.12.85.70

**FINLAND – FINLANDE**
Akateeminen Kirjakauppa
Keskuskatu 1, 00100 HELSINKI 10. Tel. 65.11.22

**FRANCE**
Bureau des Publications de l'OCDE,
2 rue André-Pascal, 75775 PARIS CEDEX 16. Tel. (1) 524.81.67
Principal correspondant :
13602 AIX-EN-PROVENCE : Librairie de l'Université.
Tel. 26.18.08

**GERMANY – ALLEMAGNE**
OECD Publications and Information Center
4 Simrockstrasse 5300 BONN Tel. (0228) 21.60.45

**GREECE – GRÈCE**
Librairie Kauffmann, 28 rue du Stade,
ATHÈNES 132. Tel. 322.21.60

**HONG-KONG**
Government Information Services,
Publications/Sales Section, Baskerville House,
2/F., 22 Ice House Street

**ICELAND – ISLANDE**
Snaebjörn Jónsson and Co., h.f.,
Hafnarstraeti 4 and 9, P.O.B. 1131, REYKJAVIK.
Tel. 13133/14281/11936

**INDIA – INDE**
Oxford Book and Stationery Co. :
NEW DELHI-1, Scindia House. Tel. 45896
CALCUTTA 700016, 17 Park Street. Tel. 240832

**INDONESIA – INDONÉSIE**
PDIN-LIPI, P.O. Box 3065/JKT., JAKARTA, Tel. 583467

**IRELAND – IRLANDE**
TDC Publishers – Library Suppliers
12 North Frederick Street, DUBLIN 1 Tel. 744835-749677

**ITALY – ITALIE**
Libreria Commissionaria Sansoni :
Via Lamarmora 45, 50121 FIRENZE. Tel. 579751
Via Bartolini 29, 20155 MILANO. Tel. 365083
Sub-depositari :
Editrice e Libreria Herder,
Piazza Montecitorio 120, 00 186 ROMA. Tel. 6794628
Libreria Hoepli, Via Hoepli 5, 20121 MILANO. Tel. 865446
Libreria Lattes, Via Garibaldi 3, 10122 TORINO. Tel. 519274
La diffusione delle edizioni OCSE è inoltre assicurata dalle migliori librerie nelle città più importanti.

**JAPAN – JAPON**
OECD Publications and Information Center,
Landic Akasaka Bldg., 2-3-4 Akasaka,
Minato-ku, TOKYO 107 Tel. 586.2016

**KOREA – CORÉE**
Pan Korea Book Corporation,
P.O. Box n° 101 Kwangwhamun, SÉOUL. Tel. 72.7369

**LEBANON – LIBAN**
Documenta Scientifica/Redico,
Edison Building, Bliss Street, P.O. Box 5641, BEIRUT.
Tel. 354429 – 344425

**MALAYSIA – MALAISIE**
and/et **SINGAPORE - SINGAPOUR**
University of Malaysia Co-operative Bookshop Ltd.
P.O. Box 1127, Jalan Pantai Baru
KUALA LUMPUR. Tel. 51425, 54058, 54361

**THE NETHERLANDS – PAYS-BAS**
Staatsuitgeverij
Verzendboekhandel Chr. Plantijnstraat 1
Postbus 20014
2500 EA S-GRAVENAGE. Tel. nr. 070.789911
Voor bestellingen: Tel. 070.789208

**NEW ZEALAND – NOUVELLE-ZÉLANDE**
Publications Section,
Government Printing Office Bookshops:
AUCKLAND: Retail Bookshop: 25 Rutland Street,
Mail Orders: 85 Beach Road, Private Bag C.P.O.
HAMILTON: Retail Ward Street,
Mail Orders, P.O. Box 857
WELLINGTON: Retail: Mulgrave Street (Head Office),
Cubacade World Trade Centre
Mail Orders: Private Bag
CHRISTCHURCH: Retail: 159 Hereford Street,
Mail Orders: Private Bag
DUNEDIN: Retail: Princes Street
Mail Order: P.O. Box 1104

**NORWAY – NORVÈGE**
J.G. TANUM A/S Karl Johansgate 43
P.O. Box 1177 Sentrum OSLO 1. Tel. (02) 80.12.60

**PAKISTAN**
Mirza Book Agency, 65 Shahrah Quaid-E-Azam, LAHORE 3.
Tel. 66839

**PHILIPPINES**
National Book Store, Inc
Library Services Division, P.O. Box 1934, MANILA.
Tel. Nos. 49.43.06 to 09, 40.53.45, 49.45.12

**PORTUGAL**
Livraria Portugal, Rua do Carmo 70-74,
1117 LISBOA CODEX. Tel. 360582/3

**SPAIN – ESPAGNE**
Mundi-Prensa Libros, S.A.
Castelló 37, Apartado 1223, MADRID-1. Tel. 275.46.55
Libreria Bastinos, Pelayo 52, BARCELONA 1. Tel. 222.06.00

**SWEDEN – SUÈDE**
AB CE Fritzes Kungl Hovbokhandel,
Box 16 356, S 103 27 STH, Regeringsgatan 12,
DS STOCKHOLM. Tel. 08/23.89.00

**SWITZERLAND – SUISSE**
OECD Publications and Information Center
4 Simrockstrasse 5300 BONN. Tel. (0228) 21.60.45
Local Agents/Agents locaux
Librairie Payot, 6 rue Grenus, 1211 GENÈVE 11. Tel. 022.31.89.50
Freihofer A.G., Weinbergstr. 109, CH-8006 ZÜRICH.
Tel. 01.3634282

**THAILAND – THAILANDE**
Suksit Siam Co., Ltd., 1715 Rama IV Rd,
Samyan, BANGKOK 5. Tel. 2511630

**TURKEY – TURQUIE**
Kültur Yayinlari Is-Türk Ltd. Sti.
Atatürk Bulvari No : 77/B
KIZILAY/ANKARA. Tel. 17 02 66
Dolmabahce Cad. No : 29
BESIKTAS/ISTANBUL. Tel. 60 71 88

**UNITED KINGDOM – ROYAUME-UNI**
H.M. Stationery Office, P.O.B. 569,
LONDON SE1 9NH. Tel. 01.928.6977, Ext. 410 or
49 High Holborn, LONDON WC1V 6 HB (personal callers)
Branches at: EDINBURGH, BIRMINGHAM, BRISTOL,
MANCHESTER, CARDIFF, BELFAST.

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA – ÉTATS-UNIS**
OECD Publications and Information Center, Suite 1207,
1750 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C.20006 – 4582
Tel. (202) 724.1857

**VENEZUELA**
Libreria del Este, Avda. F. Miranda 52, Edificio Galipan,
CARACAS 106. Tel. 32.23.01/33.26.04/33.24.73

**YUGOSLAVIA – YOUGOSLAVIE**
Jugoslovenska Knjiga, Terazije 27, P.O.B. 36, BEOGRAD.
Tel. 621.992

Les commandes provenant de pays où l'OCDE n'a pas encore désigné de dépositaire peuvent être adressées à :
OCDE, Bureau des Publications, 2, rue André-Pascal, 75775 PARIS CEDEX 16.

Orders and inquiries from countries where sales agents have not yet been appointed may be sent to:
OECD, Publications Office, 2 rue André-Pascal, 75775 PARIS CEDEX 16.